



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. Box 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
WWW.USPTO.GOV

Paper No.

PATENT LAW GROUP LLP
2635 NORTH FIRST STREET
SUITE 223
SAN JOSE CA 95134

MAILED
JUL 07 2011
OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :
Howington :
Application No. 09/981,653 ;
Filed: October 18, 2001 : DECISION ON PETITION
Attorney Docket No. MIS-P-104 : UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(B)
Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR :
CASINO MANAGEMENT :
:

This is a decision on the petition filed June 14, 2011, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b), to revive the above-identified application.

The petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) is **GRANTED**.

The above-identified application became abandoned due to the March 15, 2011 decision of the Board for Patent Appeals and Interferences which upheld the Examiner's rejections. Accordingly, the above-identified application became abandoned on May 16, 2011, the expiration of the period for seeking judicial review of this decision.¹ A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on May 31, 2011.

A grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

- (1) The reply required to the outstanding Office action or notice, unless previously filed;
- (2) The petition fee as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(m);
- (3) A statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition

¹ See MPEP § 1216.

pursuant to this paragraph was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional, and;

- (4) Any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.20(d)) required pursuant to paragraph (d) of this section.

With this petition, Petitioner has submitted the petition fee and the proper statement of unintentional delay. Petitioner has further indicated that a divisional application has been filed.

Office records confirm that divisional application no. 13/160,420 was filed on June 14, 2011.

The first three requirements of Rule 1.137(b) have been met. The fourth requirement of Rule 1.137(b) is not applicable, as a terminal disclaimer is not required.²

Since this application is being revived for purposes of continuity only and since continuity has been established by this decision reviving the application, the application is again abandoned in favor of divisional application number 13/160,420.

Telephone inquiries regarding *this decision* should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3225.³ All other inquiries concerning examination procedures should be directed to the Technology Center.

/Paul Shanoski/
Paul Shanoski
Senior Attorney
Office of Petitions

² See Rule 1.137(d).

³ Petitioner will note that all practice before the Office should be in writing, and the action of the Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.2. As such, Petitioner is reminded that no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for any further action(s) of Petitioner.